

Appl. No. : 08/942,005
Filed : October 1, 1997

configured to allow a user to selectively disable a display of one or more alerts to the user. There is nothing in columns 9-12 of Bonnell which teaches an alert module or an event manager that is configured to "selectively disable a display of one or more alerts to the user." In fact, the word "display" is not even found in columns 9-12 of Bonnell, which were cited by the Examiner.

As stated in Applicant's response to the first Office Action, Bonnell discloses a plurality of consoles (col. 10, line 63 to col. 11, line 16; Figure 17) which are registered with an agent to receive only certain events from the agent through event filters (Figures 22-23). Each console may send a registration message to the agent to indicate which types of information the console desires to receive, such as application-level, instance-level or parameter-level information (col. 11, line 17 to col. 12, line 51; Figures 18-20). If a console is not "interested" in receiving certain information from an agent, the agent does not send that information to the console. There is absolutely nothing in Bonnell to suggest an alert module allowing a user to selectively enable or disable a display of one or more alerts to the user.

Furthermore, the event manager 210, the event repository 206 and Figure 12 of Bonnell cited by the Examiner relate to an agent software system 202, which operates at a server computer system 14 shown in Figure 11 of Bonnell. In contrast, the alert module of Claim 1 in the present application operates at a manager system (also referred to as a host, user or client computer system), which receives alerts from an agent/server computer (Figure 1 of the present application). Amended Claim 1 has been twice amended to clarify that the alert module executes at a manager system, which receives alerts for an agent computer. In amended Claim 1, the status information associated with the alerts are recorded by the alert module in the manager system. It is irrelevant whether or not the status information is recorded at the agent or server computer. Therefore, the event manager 210, the event repository 206 and Figure 12 of Bonnell cited by the Examiner are irrelevant to amended Claim 1.

Thus, Bonnell does not teach an alert module which is configured to allow a user to selectively disable a display of one or more alerts (from an agent computer) to the user at the manager system, as claimed in amended Claim 1 of the present application. Nor is there any teaching, suggestion or motivation in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bonnell to achieve the same functionality as the claimed invention. See In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988); Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 2143.01, page 2100-111.

Appl. No. : 08/942,005
Filed : October 1, 1997

The mere fact that a reference, such as Bonnell, can be modified does not render the resultant combination, the alert module in the claimed invention, obvious unless the prior art suggests the desirability of the combination. In re Mills, 916 F.2d 680 (Fed. Cir. 1990); MPEP, Sect. 2143.01, page 2100-112. To establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. In re Royka, 490 F.2d 981 (CCPA 1974); MPEP, Sect. 2143.03 and 706.02(j). In the present case, Bonnell does not teach or suggest an alert module which allows a user to selectively disable (or enable) a display of one or more alerts to the user of the computer.

Because Bonnell does not teach an alert module which allows a user to selectively disable (or enable) a display of one or more alerts to the user of the computer, the Examiner impermissibly uses hindsight of the teachings in the present invention, and not the teachings of the prior art, to reject amended Claim 1. In re Dembiczak, 175 F.3d 994, 999 (Fed. Cir. 1999)(holding the Board impermissibly used hindsight in determining obviousness); MPEP, Sect. 2145, part X.A., page 2100-137. In Dembiczak, the Federal Circuit reiterated that a determination of obviousness cannot simply rely on the inventor's disclosure as a "blueprint" without evidence of a suggestion, teaching or motivation in the prior art. Dembiczak, 175 F.3d 994, 999. According to MPEP Section 706.02(j), "[t]he teaching and suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation for success must both be found in the prior art and not based on applicant's disclosure." (emphasis added). For this reason, withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection as to amended Claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claim 2 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

As to amended Claim 2, the Examiner takes the position that Bonnell discloses a "data structure for implementing event filtering at the agent software which passes data regarding certain events to management consoles interested in those events." The Examiner specifically cited Figure 22 and column 13 of Bonnell in support of the Examiner's position.

Applicant agrees with the Examiner that Bonnell discloses a data structure for implementing event filtering at the agent software which passes data regarding certain events to management consoles interested in those events. Bonnell, however, does not teach an alert module with a plurality of variables that indicate whether each alert notification is disabled or enabled for display to the user, as claimed in amended Claim 2 of the present application. Claim 2 was amended to clarify this aspect of the claimed invention in Applicant's response to the first

Appl. No. : 08/942,005
Filed : October 1, 1997

Office Action, and amended Claim 2 is dependent from amended Claim 1. There is nothing in Figure 22 or column 13 of Bonnell to suggest the claimed invention of amended Claim 2. For this reason alone, withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Furthermore, the "data structure for implementing event filtering at the agent software" cited by the Examiner resides and operates at the agent computer in Bonnell. In contrast, in Claim 2 of the present application, the alert module and the plurality of variables reside at the manager system. Moreover, amended Claim 2 has been further amended to clarify that the alerts are disabled or enabled to be displayed to the user at the manager system. Thus, the "data structure for implementing event filtering at the agent software" is irrelevant to amended Claim 2 of the present application. For this reason, withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claim 3 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

As to amended Claim 3, the Examiner takes the position that Bonnell discloses a "set of event catalogs 220-224 containing enumerated records regarding event descriptions." The Examiner specifically cited Figure 15 and column 10 of Bonnell in support of the Examiner's position.

Applicant agrees with the Examiner that Bonnell discloses event catalogs 220-224 containing enumerated records regarding event descriptions for agent software 202 (column 10, lines 11-14). Bonnell, however, does not teach an alert module which records information about alerts which have been disabled for display to a user in a storage medium at the manager system, as claimed in Claim 3 of the present application. Claim 3 is dependent from amended Claim 1. There is nothing in Figure 15 or column 10 of Bonnell to suggest the claimed invention of Claim 3. For this reason alone, withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

In addition, there is another reason for allowing Claim 3. In a preferred embodiment of the claimed invention, the alert module at the manager system receives all alerts (both enabled and disabled for display) from an agent computer and records information about all of the alerts in a storage medium at the manager system for easy access by the user if the user decides to view the alerts. The alert module of Claim 3 records information about the alerts which have been disabled from being displayed to the user in a storage medium at the manager system. Claim 3 has been amended to clarify this aspect of the claimed invention.

Appl. No. : 08/942,005
Filed : October 1, 1997

In contrast, the system in Bonnell uses interest masks, instance interest masks, parameter interest masks and event filters to prevent a console (e.g., a manager system) from even receiving particular information from an agent (col. 11, lines 42-46; col. 13, lines 9-34). In other words, "events are only reported to interested consoles, and even then only to interested consoles whose event filters are satisfied by the event" (col. 14, lines 7-12). Bonnell does not teach an alert module which records information about the alerts which have been disabled from being displayed to the user in a storage medium at the manager system, as claimed in amended Claim 3. In fact, Bonnell teaches away from the claimed invention because Bonnell teaches event filters which prevent a console from even receiving particular information from an agent. Thus, for this reason, withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Moreover, the "set of event catalogs 220-224 containing enumerated records regarding event descriptions" in Bonnell cited by the Examiner resides at the agent computer in the Bonnell system (column 10, lines 11-14). Because amended Claim 3 relates to a storage medium at a manager system, not an agent computer, the event catalogs 220-224 cited by the Examiner are irrelevant to amended Claim 3.

If the Examiner relies on only one of the foregoing reasons above for withdrawing the 103(a) rejection, the other reasons shall be deemed withdrawn by Applicant and shall not be construed as a basis for patentability relied on by Applicant.

Rejection of Claim 4 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

As to Claim 4, the Examiner takes the position that Bonnell teaches a log module at a manager system configured to store information about enabled and disabled alerts. The Examiner cites Figure 13 and columns 2 and 9 in Bonnell for support. The Examiner further states that Bonnell discloses a set event manager 52 and event cache 212 which is responsible for keeping records of various occurrences throughout the computer network, such as the occurrence of alarm conditions.

Applicant agrees that Bonnell discloses an event manager 52 which is responsible for keeping a record of various occurrences throughout the computer network, such as the occurrence of alarm conditions (column 2, lines 51-54). Bonnell, however, does not teach a log module configured to store information about alerts which have been enabled or disabled by the user for display to the user. Amended Claim 4 is dependent from amended Claim 1, which has

Appl. No. : 08/942,005
Filed : October 1, 1997

been amended to clarify this aspect of the claimed invention. For this reason alone, withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

In addition, in Bonnell, the structure of the event cache 212 of the manager system 200 (Figure 13) may be similar to the structure of the event repository 206 of the agent system shown Figures 12 and 15 (col. 9, lines 58-60), but the contents of the event cache 212 and the event repository are different. The event cache 212 associated with the manager system 200 (console) disclosed in Bonnell only contains events which the manager 200 is interested in receiving from an agent 202 and which have satisfied event filters (associated with a particular manager 200) stored at the agent 202 (column 14, lines 1-10 and 30-47; Figures 12-13 and 25). As explained above, the agent 202 in Bonnell only sends events to a manager 200 which satisfy the event filters associated with the manager 200 (col. 11, lines 42-46; col. 13, lines 9-34).

In contrast, Claim 4 of the present application claims a log module at the manager system which stores information about all alerts from an agent. Amended Claim 4 has been further amended to clarify this aspect of the invention. Bonnell teaches away from the claimed invention because Bonnell teaches event filters which prevent a manager from even receiving particular information from an agent. Thus, for this reason, withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner relies on only one of the two reasons above for withdrawing the 103(a) rejection, the other reason shall be deemed withdrawn by Applicant and shall not be construed as a basis for patentability relied on by Applicant.

Rejection of Claim 5 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

As to Claim 5, the Examiner takes the position that Bonnell teaches a log module which stores a name of a component associated with one of the alerts using an event description field. The Examiner cites Figure 15 and column 10 in Bonnell for support.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. As described above with respect to amended Claim 4, Bonnell does not teach a log module configured to store information about alerts which have been enabled or disabled by the user for display to the user. Claim 5 depends from amended Claims 1 and 4, which have been amended to clarify the claimed invention. For this reason alone, withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

In addition, as described above, the event cache 212 associated with the manager system 200 (console) disclosed in Bonnell only contains events which the manager 200 is interested in

Appl. No. : 08/942,005
Filed : October 1, 1997

receiving from an agent 202 and which have satisfied event filters (associated with a particular manager 200) stored at the agent 202 (column 14, lines 1-10 and 30-47; Figures 12-13 and 25). As explained above, the agent 202 in Bonnell only sends events to a manager 200 which satisfy the event filters associated with the manager 200 (col. 11, lines 42-46; col. 13, lines 9-34).

In contrast, Claim 5 of the present application claims a log module at the manager system which stores a name of a component associated with one of the alerts which are all received from the agent. Bonnell teaches away from the claimed invention because Bonnell teaches event filters which prevent a manager from even receiving particular information from an agent. Thus, for this reason, withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner relies on only one of the two reasons above for withdrawing the 103(a) rejection, the other reason shall be deemed withdrawn by Applicant and shall not be construed as a basis for patentability relied on by Applicant.

Rejection of Claim 6 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

As to Claim 6, the Examiner takes the position that Bonnell discloses a set event manager 52 and an event cache 212 responsible for keeping records of various occurrences throughout the computer network, such as the occurrence of alarm conditions and their resolution. The Examiner cites Figure 13 and columns 2 and 9 in Bonnell for support.

Applicant agrees that Bonnell discloses an event manager ~~which~~ 52 which is responsible for keeping records of various occurrences throughout the computer network, such as the occurrence of alarm conditions and their resolution (column 2, lines 51-54). But as described above, Bonnell does not teach a log module configured to store information about alerts which have been enabled or disabled by the user for display to the user. Claim 6 depends from amended Claims 1 and 4, which have been amended to clarify the claimed invention. For this reason alone, withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

In addition, the event manager 52 associated with the manager system 200 disclosed in Bonnell is only responsible for keeping a record of occurrences which the manager 200 is interested in receiving from an agent 202 and which have satisfied event filters (associated with a particular manager 200) stored at the agent 202 (column 14, lines 1-10 and 30-47; Figures 12-13 and 25). As explained above, the agent 202 in Bonnell only sends events to a manager 200 which satisfy the event filters associated with the manager 200 (col. 11, lines 42-46; col. 13, lines 9-34).

Appl. No. : 08/942,005
Filed : October 1, 1997

In contrast, Claim 6 of the present application claims a log module at the manager system which stores a recommended course of action associated with one of the alerts which are all received from the agent. Bonnell teaches away from the claimed invention because Bonnell teaches event filters which prevent a manager from even receiving particular information from an agent. Thus, for this reason, withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Furthermore, the "resolution" of alarm conditions in Bonnell suggests that the alarm condition has been resolved. In contrast, Claim 6 of the present application claims a "recommended course of action" to the user. Bonnell does not teach the storage of a recommended course of action associated with an alert. To establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. In re Royka, 490 F.2d 981 (CCPA 1974); MPEP, Sect. 2143.03 and 706.02(j).

If the Examiner relies on only one of the three reasons above for withdrawing the 103(a) rejection, the other reason shall be deemed withdrawn by Applicant and shall not be construed as a basis for patentability relied on by Applicant.

Rejection of Claim 7 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

As to Claim 7, the Examiner takes the position that Bonnell discloses a graphical user interface module 50 which coordinates the representation and display of alarm conditions. The Examiner cites Figure 13 and column 2 of Bonnell for support.

The Applicant respectfully disagrees. In Bonnell, the graphical user interface 50 associated with the manager 200 (Figure 13) coordinates the representation of pop-up windows for command menus and the display of requested or monitored data (column 2, lines 48-51). As explained above, the manager 200 only receives events or data which the manager 200 is interested in receiving from an agent 202 and which have satisfied event filters (associated with a particular manager 200) stored at the agent 202 (column 14, lines 1-10 and 30-47; Figures 12-13 and 25). Thus, the graphical user interface 50 in Bonnell can only coordinate the display of particular events or data which the manager 200 actually receives.

In contrast, Claim 4 of the present application claims a log module at the manager system which stores information about all alerts from an agent. Claim 6 depends from amended Claims 1 and 4, which have been further amended to clarify the invention. Bonnell teaches away from the claimed invention because Bonnell teaches event filters which prevent a manager from even

Appl. No. : 08/942,005
Filed : October 1, 1997

receiving particular information from an agent. Thus, for this reason, withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

In addition, there is nothing in Bonnell that teaches a user interface which allows a user at the manager system to select one or more types of alerts for future display to the user by providing a description of the alerts to the user. Claim 7 was amended in Applicant's response to the first Office Action to specifically and distinctly claim this aspect of the invention.

If the Examiner relies on only one of the two reasons above for withdrawing the 103(a) rejection, the other reason shall be deemed withdrawn by Applicant and shall not be construed as a basis for patentability relied on by Applicant.

Rejection of Claims 8 and 9 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

As to Claims 8 and 9, the Examiner takes the position that Bonnell teaches the claimed limitation wherein the user interface is configured to enable selected alerts in response to an enable command or disable selected alerts in response to a disable command. The Examiner asserts that Bonnell discloses a data structure for implementing event filtering at the agent software which passes data regarding certain events to management consoles in those events. The Examiner cites Figure 22 and column 13 in Bonnell for support.

The Applicant completely agrees that Bonnell discloses a data structure 320 (Figure 22) for implementing event filtering at the agent software 202 (Figure 12) which passes data regarding certain events to management consoles interested in those events. In fact, the event filtering at the agent software 202 (Figure 12) cited by the Examiner teaches away from claimed invention. In a preferred embodiment of the present invention, the manager system receives all of the alerts from the agent. The user interface as claimed in Claims 8 and 9 of the present application allows a user at the manager system to select one or more alert types and either enable or disable the future display of the selected alert types at the manager system. There is nothing in Bonnell that teaches the claimed limitations of Claims 8 and 9. Withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

[John, I abbreviated my comments for the rest of the rejections below to save time because we probably want to conduct a telephone interview with the Examiner]

Rejection of Claims 10-12 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Bonnell does not teach an alert notification window which displays alert notifications which have not been selectively disabled by the user at the manager system.

Appl. No. : 08/942,005
Filed : October 1, 1997

Rejection of Claim 13 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Applicant respectfully disagrees. There is nothing in Figures 15, 24 and 25 and columns 2-7 and 13-14 of Bonnell which teach Claim 13 of the present application. Bonnell does not teach a status module (in a second computer) which transforms a notification having a first data length (from a first computer) into a user-friendly display message comprising a second data length, wherein the second data length is significantly greater than the first data length. In fact, 13 Bonnell does not teach or suggest a notification having a first data length which is greater than, less than or equal to the data length of a user-friendly display message. Bonnell simply teaches a database 49 representing objects, and information associated with the objects, "in a form that will be readily useable by a graphical user interface module 50" (col. 2, lines 37-42).

Rejection of Claim 14 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

As to Claim 14, the Examiner asserts that Bonnell teaches a first computer and a second computer connected by a computer network. Claim 14 is dependent from Claim 13. As described above with respect to Claim 13, Bonnell does not teach a second computer displaying a user-friendly message regarding the status of a component in a first computer, wherein the user-friendly message has a data length that is substantially greater than the data length of a notification from the first computer. Withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claim 15 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

As to Claim 15, the Examiner admits that Bonnell does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation of Claim 15 wherein the computer network performs SNMP transactions. The Examiner cited Figures 27A-27B and columns 12-15 of Bonnell for support.

Claim 15 of the present application depends from independent Claim 13. Claim 13 includes a status module that transforms a notification having a first data length into a user-friendly display message having a second data length, wherein the second data length is significantly greater than the first data length. Bonnell does not teach the claimed limitation of Claim 13. Thus, Bonnell does not teach dependent Claim 15. Withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 16-21 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 16-21 are dependent from Claim 13. As described above with respect to Claim 13, Bonnell does not teach a second computer displaying a user-friendly message regarding the status of a component in a first computer, wherein the user-friendly message has a data length

Appl. No. : 08/942,005
Filed : October 1, 1997

that is substantially greater than the data length of a notification from the first computer. Moreover, the knowledge module parser 44, knowledge module 38, knowledge database manager 46, database 47, manager software 34 and event manager 52 disclosed in Bonnell do not perform the same functionality as the index, which is used by the claimed invention to identify a user-friendly display message. Thus, Bonnell does not teach the claimed invention of Claims 16-21. Withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 22-24 and 34 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

For the reasons stated above with respect to Claims 1-21 above, withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection of Claims 22-24 and 34 is respectfully requested. Moreover, for Claims 22-24, Bonnell does not teach an alert module in a second computer wherein the alert module accesses a management information base to transform an alert (from a first computer) comprising an index into a user-friendly display message. (22)

Rejection of Claims 25-26 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 25 has been amended, and Claim 26 has been cancelled.

The Examiner admits that Bonnell does not explicitly state the limitation of an alert module. The Examiner also admits that Bonnell does not explicitly disclose the claimed limitation of enabling or disabling the display of any combination of selected alerts in response to a single command from the user. (25)

Bonnell discloses a graphical user interface module 50 which coordinates the display of requested or monitored data (column 2, lines 48-51). There is nothing in Bonnell that teaches (1) a display configured to allow a user to select at least two alerts and (2) an alert manager module configured to enable or disable the display of any combination of alerts selected by the user in response to a single command from the user, as claimed in amended Claim 25 of the present application. There is nothing in Bonnell to suggest modifying the event manager 200 of Bonnell to achieve the same functions of the alert module in Claim 25 of the present application.

Second, the agent 202 in Bonnell prevents the manager 200 from receiving certain events or alerts. As described above, the selective reception of events or alerts by the manager 200 teaches away from the present invention.

Th Examiner further relied on Dulman. The Examiner cites Figures 9A-9H and columns 17-18 of Dulman for support.

Appl. No. : 08/942,005
Filed : October 1, 1997

First, in Dulman, the word "alarm" does not have the same meaning as "alert" in Claim 25 of the present application. An "alarm" in Figures 9A-9H and columns 17-18 in Dulman comprises a system or component with an abnormal status condition (e.g., failure). The "alarm" is only displayed to the user when the user "selects" a number of icons, one after another, in the hierarchy of windows to access a particular icon associated with an abnormal status condition (column 18, lines 14-21). For example, to discover an alarm condition associated with the voice lines 128 (Figure 9G), the user must select the icon 110 in Figure 9A, then select the icon 114a in Figure 9B, then select the icon 122 in Figure 9C, which then displays the icon 128 in Figure 9G (column 18, lines 11-21). Thus, in Dulman, the user must "select" a series of individual icons that are arranged in a hierarchy of graphical user windows to discover an alarm condition.

In contrast, in a preferred embodiment of the present invention, an "alert" (such as the alert notification window 500 as shown in Figure 5) pops up automatically and may interrupt an application currently being run by the user on the manager computer. The alert notification occurs substantially immediately after an abnormal condition is detected. The user does not have to "select" one or more icons to discover an abnormal condition. Dulman does not teach the display of alert notifications to the user, as claimed in amended Claim 25.

Second, the word "select" in Dulman does not have the same meaning as the word "select" in Claim 25 of the present invention. In Figures 9A-9H of Dulman, when a user "selects" an icon from the plurality of available icons in a window, the user is presented with a display of icons which are lower in a hierarchy of systems and components (column 17, lines 21-28, 40-42). The operational status of each icon of the hierarchy is indicated by the color red, green, yellow or orange (column 17, lines 35-45). The highest operational error or alarm (either red or yellow) is propagated from the lowest topology layer to the highest layer (column 17, line 66 - column 18, line 10).

In contrast, in Claim 25 of the present invention, the word "select" refers to choosing which types of future alert notifications to display to the user. Specifically, Dulman does not teach (1) a display configured to allow a user to select at least two alerts and (2) an alert manager module configured to enable or disable the display of any combination of alert notification types selected by the user in response to a single command from the user, as claimed in amended Claim 25 of the present application. Withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claim 27 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Appl. No. : 08/942,005
Filed : October 1, 1997

Claim 27 is dependent from Claim 25. Dulman does not teach the limitations of base Claim 25. Moreover, there is nothing in Dulman or Bonnell that teaches an alert manager module configured to enable or disable the display of any combination of alert notification types selected by the user in response to a single command from the user, wherein the alerts relate to the status of a plurality of components in a plurality of network servers, as claimed in amended Claim 27 of the present application. Withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claim 28 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 28 is dependent from Claim 25. Dulman does not teach the limitations of base Claim 25. Moreover, there is nothing in Dulman or Bonnell that teaches allowing a user to simultaneously select at least two alert types corresponding to at least two servers for display or non-display to the user. Withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claim 29 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner admits that Bonnell does not teach the claimed limitation wherein one of the alerts relates to the status of a central processing unit.

Claim 29 is dependent from Claim 25. Dulman does not teach the limitations of base Claim 25. Again, the meaning of "alarms" in Dulman is different from the meaning of "alerts" in Claim 25 of the present application. Dulman and Bonnell, alone or in combination, do not teach an alert manager module configured to enable or disable the display of any combination of selected alert notifications in response to a single command from the user, wherein one of the alerts relates to the status of a central processing unit. Withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection of Claims 30-33 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner stated that the rejection of Claims 1-29 and 34 are fully applied to Claims 30-33. In addition, the Examiner admits that Bonnell does not teach the claimed limitation wherein one of the alerts relates to the status of a fan, a temperature sensor, a power supply or a fault isolation unit. The Examiner, however, takes the position that Giorgio teaches a method for monitoring various parameters such as a fan, a temperature sensor, a power supply or a fault isolation unit for equipment at network sites. The Examiner states that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bonnell in view of Giorgio so that various parameters are monitored. The Examiner states that one would be motivated to do so to optimize the working parameters of a network node.

Appl. No. : 08/942,005
Filed : October 1, 1997

Applicant respectfully disagrees. Giorgio discloses a network manager which sends a request to a microcontroller, and the microcontroller responds to the request by transferring values monitored by the microcontroller to the network manager (Abstract; Figure 5; col. 6, lines 2-5; col. 8, lines 21-23). Giorgio does not teach an agent sending alerts to a manager.

Claims 30-33 are dependent from Claim 25. Bonnell, Giorgio, and/or Dulman, alone or in combination, do not teach (1) a computer configured to generate a plurality of alerts which are associated with status information of the computer's components; (2) a display executing in a manager computer, wherein the display is configured to allow a user to select at least two of the alerts; and (3) an alert manager module executing in the manager computer, wherein the alert manager module is configured to enable or disable the display of any combination of selected alerts in response to a single command from the user. Thus, withdrawal of the 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

Again, the meaning of "alarms" in Dulman is different from the meaning of "alerts" in Claim 25 of the present application.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all claims are believed to be in condition for allowance, and such allowance is earnestly solicited. If any issues remain to be resolved, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned to promptly resolve any such issues.

Appl. No. : 08/942,005
Filed : October 1, 1997

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: _____

By: _____

John M. Carson
Registration No. 34,303
Attorney of Record
620 Newport Center Drive
Sixteenth Floor
Newport Beach, CA 92660
(619) 235-8550

H:\DOCS\ACC\ACC-1353.DOC
102899